exempt from licensing for all articles of manufacture which are not covered by Schedule I and II to the Notification No. 477(E) dated 25th July, 1991.

(d) There is no change in the list of items reserved for exclusive manufacture in small scale sector under the new industrial policy.

Increasing the Liabilities assessed against M/s. Hoechst after review by special team

1660. SHRI NARAYAN KAR:

DR. R. K. PODDAR:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 376 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th July, 1991 and state:

(a) what are the basis on which special team assessee the liability against M|s. Hoechst as Rs. 4.58 crores up to December, 1988 and what are the reasons for increase of liability to Rs. 24.91 crores of same drugs and formulations of the same period after review;

(b) whether it is a fact that this is a clear case of malafide;

(c) if so, what steps have been taken to investigate the matter;

(d) whether it is a fact that Government have received number of complaints of corruption from Members of Parliament against the members of Special Team and former Development Commissioner (PI); and

(e) if so, what is the total number of complaints and what steps have been taken on these complaints as required by law?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (e) The tentative liability of M|s. Hoechst for the period upto 31.12.83 has gone up from Rs. 4.58 crores to Rs. 24.91 crores as a result of the review undertaken because of receipt of a number of complaints alleging acts of omission and commission on the part of the Special Team. These included inaccurate reckoning of the Company's bulk drug prices, in the computation of the liabilities grant of unauthorised and inadmissible set offs in the quantaties of production and sale, and the sale value of various drugs and formulations. The question of taking action against any one in this regard would arise only after the liabilities are finally determined.

Special leave petition against the stay of Delhi High Court

1661. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA:

SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 368 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th July, 1991, and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government did not file special leave petition in Supreme Court against the stay of Delhi High Court;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether it is also a fact that extension of price fixed in 1989 from 1981 in the case of Betamethesone was a lapse and contrary to the High Court Judgement and also contrary to the Supreme Court Judgement in Cyanamid case;

(d) whether it is also a fact that this lapse has resulted a benefit of Rs. 34.78 crores in favour of the company; and

(e) if so, who was responsible for the lapse and what action has been taken so far?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (e) Consequent upon receipt of additional data from the company and as a result of the review of the computations made last year, the tentative liability of the company was revised from Rs. 37 crores to Rs. 71.78 crores and communicated to it. The Company's Writ